

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated July 21, 2003, claims 2, 23, and 44 have been cancelled, claims 1, 3, 5, 22, 24, 26, 43, 45, and 47 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-22, 24-43, and 45-105 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 64-105 have been allowed. Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter. However, Applicants traverse the rejections of the non-allowable claims as set forth in more detail below.

III. Prior Art Rejections

In paragraphs (3)-(4) of the Office Action, claims 1-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson, U.S. Patent No. 5,842,218 A (Robinson) in view of Glasser et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,956,715 A (Glasser).

Applicants acknowledge the indication of allowable claims, but respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claims 1, 22, 43 are generally directed to an invention that provides for the creation of a customized tree. The present amendments provide for the creation of a filter for selecting objects. The filter specifies selection criteria to select objects to be contained within a selected object of/on a customized tree. The amendments also provide that the filter is saved. Objects from one tree are selected by a user by applying the filter. The selected objects are located in disparate places across different branches of the original tree. Thereafter, the selected objects are linked to each other in the customized tree in a user-specified manner. Further, the claims provide that security restrictions for accessing the selected objects are defined using the customized tree. Thus, as claimed, filters for creating a customized tree may be created and saved/stored for later modification.

The cited references do not teach nor suggest these various elements of Applicants' independent claims.

Robinson merely describes a method computer program product, and system for a reorienting categorization table. A control interface is used to select the hierarchy of categorization levels for a categorization table into a quantity of data records. Once the user selects the desired hierarchy, the categorization table will reorient itself into the chosen categorization level hierarchy with the records in their appropriate locations. This allows more flexibility and a more efficient mechanism for putting the data into a desired organization. The user may reorient the categorization table as desired using the control interface. Robinson finds particular usefulness in a database browser wherein the database is queried for potential records according to both a desired categorization level hierarchy and constraints on the potential categorization level values within one or more of the categorization levels. In effect, this filters the records so that a selection categorization table (capable of reorientation) is created with a manageable number of pertinent and relevant data records indicated therein from the results of the query. From there, records are selected to be placed in a retrieval categorization table (also capable of reorientation). Record references may be switched back and forth between the selection categorization table and the retrieval categorization table until a final set of references indicating desired records is attained. The references for the final set of records is used to make the actual record retrieval for processing each of the entire records or a portion thereof.

However, Robinson lacks any discussion about filters that specify selection criteria to selecting objects. Further, Robinson lacks any discussion about saving the filters so that the selection criteria can be edited at a later time/date. Robinson merely refers to actually selecting a subset of values for particular categorization levels that thereby act as a "filter" (in name only) to narrow down the records to fewer records (see col. 10, lines 38-49). In this regard, Robinson actually places quotes around the term "filter" to indicate that the described steps merely act as a filter. Robinson completely fails to describe or allude to creating an actual filter that is saved. In the present invention, since the filter is actually saved, the filtering criteria may be retrieved at a later time, changed, and saved again (see FIG. 17, and page 14, lines 11-22 of the present specification). Thus, the present invention provides flexibility with respect to filter use and filtering criteria that is not available, described, or suggested, implicitly or explicitly in Robinson or Glasser.

The amendments added some of the limitations from dependent claims 2, 23, and 44. These claims were rejected based on col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 8 of Robinson. The cited portion of

Robinson refers to Robinson's Summary of the Invention. The details regarding such support is in col. 10, lines 38-49. By reviewing both of these sections, it may be seen that Robinson refers not to the creation of an actual filter with selection criteria (as claimed) but merely selecting a subset of values for a categorization level to "filter" through many records potentially available. In this regard, a filter (as claimed) is not taught or suggested. Further, Robinson completely fails to provide for saving such a filter.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicants' claimed invention together provide operational advantages over Robinson and Glasser. In addition, Applicants' invention solves problems not recognized by Robinson and Glasser.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 22, 43 are allowable over Robinson and Glasser. Further, dependent claims 3-21, 24-42, and 45-63 are submitted to be allowable over Robinson and Glasser in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 22, and 43, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 3-21, 24-42, and 45-63 recite additional novel elements not shown by Robinson and Glasser.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date:

By: 

Name: George H. Gates

Reg. No.: 33,500

GHG/JSF/amb

G&C 30571.285-US-U1

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

OCT 22 2003

OFFICIAL